

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
EUGENE DIVISION

MILES HART; and ELIZABETH TANENBAUM,  
on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Case No. 6:21 cv 00663-MK  
**ORDER**

Plaintiffs,

v.

J.H. BAXTER & CO., INC., J.H. BAXTER & CO.,  
a California limited partnership; and GEORGIA  
BAXTER-KRAUSE, individually

Defendants.

---

Magistrate Judge Mustafa Kasubhai filed Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) (doc. 61) on March 14, 2023. The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. No objections have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to “make an informed, final determination.” *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds*, *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. *Ray*

v. Astrue, 2012 WL 1598239, \*1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, I review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); *see also United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case, I find no clear error.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that I ADOPT Judge Mustafa Kasubhai’s F&R (doc. 61).

Dated the 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2023.

---

/s/Ann Aiken  
Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge